Production of bulk drug and formulations of Oxytetracycline

1434. SHRI DHARANIDHAR BA SUMATARI; Will the Minister of IN DUSTRY b$_e$ pleased to refer to the 'answer to Unstarred Question 3745 given in the Rajya Sabha on 29th August, 1988 and state:

(a) whether it is a fact that special team did not have the details of production of bulk drug and formulations in respect to Oxytetracycline;

(b) if so, on what basis the amount due from Pfizer was calculated by the team;

(c) what are the reasons and justification in allowing set off of mission when it is a part of mark up MAPE;

(d) what is the number of formulation based on Oxytetracycline being marketed by Pfizer;

(e) what were the products involved in the Supreme Court litigation; and

(f) what were the prices approved by his Ministry of each product and what were the prices being charged by the company along with the production year-wise from the date of impunged price fixation orders?

THE MINISTER OF INDUSTRY (SHRI J. VENGAL RAO): (a) to (f) The required details to the extent available would be collected and laid on the Table of Houste.

Sale of telephone directories

1435. SHRI SHAMIM HASHMI: Will the Minister of COMMUNICA TIONS be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is $_a$ fact that Maha-nagar Telephone Nigam Ltd. Delhi has lost considerable income by transfer-ling the job of printing and sale of telephone directories to private parties who are now minting money at public/Government expense;

Kb) whether the MTN Ltd. continues to employ staff made redundant by this transfer of work to private parties and if so, what are th$_e$ details of losses being incurred; and

(c) whether Government propose to dispense with private arrangements and create a commercial section to handle the printing/sale of telephone directories?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS SHRl GIRIDHAR GOMANGO): (a) No, Sir. Introduction of scheme for printing and publishing of telephone directories through award of comprehensive contract to private parties has not only saved expenditure but has provided additional revenue also.

(b) For the work which has been given On contract to private parties, no separate staff was employed by MTNL even earlier. So, there is no question of their becoming redundant.

(c) No, Sir.

Unintended benefits eamed by drag importers

1436. SHRI M. HANUMANTHAPPA: Will the Minister of INDUSTRY be pleased to refer to the answer to Unstarred Question 3274 given in the Rajya Sabha On 22nd August 1988 and state:

(a) whether it is $_a$ fact that the importers of drugs made huge unintended benefit under DPCO, 1979;

(h) whether it is also a fact that it was obligatory for the importers to get the prices fixed before disposal under DPCO, 1979;

(c) whether it is als$_0$ a fact that the concerned importers have not been given the notices under DPEA and the amount due against each have not been calculated;

(d) if so, how and on what basis the information has been provided about disputing the amount by the parties;